Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2021 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/viewpoint8361unse

Isn't it A

pity?

AWW, MOMMA, CAN THIS REALLY BE THE END, TO BE STUCK INSIDE OF MOBILE WITH THE MEMPHIS BLUES AGAIN.....???*

VIEWPOINT Volume 8, number 3 January 22, 1971

CONTENTS

Editorial

Project Equality.....Mary Marple

Thalassa.....Brian Childs

Seminary Finances and Student Activity..Lev Sherman

McGruther's Thing.....Doug McGruther

Film Reviews: Brewster McCloud
Two Reviews of Minus 2

VIEWPOINT is an implement of destruction produced by the students of Princeton Theological Seminary because they don't have much else to do. The opinions expressed herein are not necessarily those of Princeton Theological Seminary, nor do the editors assume responsibility for opinions other than their own. Contributions of essays, criticism, poetry, fiction, and belles lettres, are welcome and should be submitted to the VIEWPOINT box in the basement of Stuart Hall.

Cover Art: Malcolm Christian Mounger

STAFF

James Johnson, editor
Malcolm Christian Mounger

(AND SOMETIMES WARR'N HELPS TOO...)

* stolen from Bob Dylan

EDITORIAL --

Recently United States Senator George McGovern (Dem., South Dakota) announced his candidacy for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1972. His announcement caused not a great deal of excitement among the national news media; it was hardly unexpected. Still, McGovern's gambit is worthy of note once it is realized that he is the only nationally prominent politician to make clear his unequivocal support of an unequivocal plan to end the Vietnamese conflict: total and immediate withdrawal of all American troops with sanctuary offered to any who desire it. By now it is apparent that Richard Nixon deceived, if not lied to, the American people when he claimed in 1968 that he had a "secret" plan to end the Vietnam war when elected. Richard Nixon has not only failed to end the war but also hurled this nation into an economic condition previously thought impossible - a period of simultaneous inflation and recession. Added to these two serious flaws is his constitutional inability to accomplish what he set out to do in 1969 - heal the fragments of a torn and divided America into a united people. Perhaps, considering these facts, we are even a little late getting started to think about 1972.

We are all tired of politics - the right, the left, and the middle - and what Richard Nixon has proven to Americans is a lesson well worth learning. That lesson is that we stand on the threshold of the twenty-first century continuing to deal with the twentieth century on the basis of a set of ideas, concepts, and presuppositions which have been inadequate for fifty years and obsolescent for twenty-five. In the post-nuclear age the two pervading world powers have invented concepts as absurd as limited conflict, guerilla warfare, and the Cold War in order to keep alive the deceit that we must destroy half of the world so that the other half may live. That deceit now shows itself in its embarassing absurdity. That lie, which has informed the peoples of both the East and the West, must be put away to provide room for an ambience of peace, understanding, and creative progress. It is time that we replace it with an idea as romantic as the "brotherhood of man".

In this light it is evident that what the United States needs at this point in its history is not so much new leadership as a new species of leadership, one in which Americans decide that they will no longer be deceived by propagandist notions of American supremacy or America as a world police force, one in which every individual leads this nation by evidencing that it is indeed possible for a great nation to live in peace without the need to colonialize. After all, unless the quality of American life is worth something in itself, then the United States has nothing to offer to the rest of the world or to history. The Christian church, if it is responsible, will dispose of silly notions like the imperfectability of man and opt instead for a little healthy utopianism.

Whether George McGovern's campaign is successful or not is beside the point. The critical issue is whether the United States can change its direction, its values, its motivating force in order to prove that it is a nation of <u>genuine</u> leaders, the land of a people who are committed to the proposition that world peace is not an unattainable ideal but merely a decision which each individual must make - the decision never to take the life of a fellow human being. If enough individuals make that decision there will never be another Presidential election in which the key issue is how to get out of Vietnam. Perhaps then the issue will become how to better the quality and conditions of human living for everyone. Certainly that is an issue far worthier of human concern.

PROJECT EQUALITY

How did you go home at Christmas? Plane, train, car? Did you know that you can take an affirmative action for equal employment, just by choosing a particular firm? And by letting a competing firm know why you did not choose it. It's true. Companies such as American Airlines, Penn Central, and Chevron Oil Company are but three of hundreds of companies across the country who have agreed to take part in Project Equality.

Project Equality of New Jersey is the eighteenth statewide organization of a nation-wide movement begun in Detroit in 1965. It is "...A statewide interreligious program whose purpose is to (close the gap between promise and performance in its undertaking to) end discrimination in employment and to encourage equal employment opportunity for all persons, especially among suppliers of goods and services to churches and church sponsored institutions." The program was started by the National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, but has been adopted by most other denominations. It was felt that since the religious community was the second largest purchaser of goods and services in this country, it had a definite responsibility to be active in affirming equal employment.

This responsibility is undertaken in two ways. First, participating institutions agree to take actions to end discrimination within their own hiring practices and, second, that they require similar actions on the part of their suppliers of goods and services. Whenever a contract is to be awarded to a company, employment practices, as well as price, quality, and service, will be taken into consideration. To aid the purchaser, Project Equality publishes a Buyers' Guide, which lists all those firms which agree to participate in Project Equality by making a formal commitment to Fair Employment Practices. These firms provide a breakdown of their total labor force by ethnic group, race and job category, and they cooperate with Project Equality in a discussion of their policies and practices.

In October, the Trustees of the Seminary approved both a participation and sponsoring membership in Project Equality of New Jersey. The latter provides that the Seminary may have a member on the P.E.N.J. Board of Trustees and also help financially. The Seminary Trustees agreed to raise half of required $1000 membership fee among themselves, with the remaining $500 to be raised by faculty and students. The Synod of New Jersey also has voted to participate in P.E.N.J., thus encouraging all individual churches in the Synod to participate.

Where do we lowly seminarians fit into the picture? First, we will be asked to suppor financially the Seminary's membership in Project Equality. Secondly, we can spread this information at our field work churches (participation denominations include Episcopal, Baptist, Lutheran, Roman Catholic, Reformed, United Methodist, and Presbyterian). The Project Equality Buyers' Guide is available by writing Project Equality of New Jersey, Inc., 744 Broad Street, Suite 601, Newark, N.J. 07102. And lastly, we can support those firms which have pledged themselves to the ideals of Project Equality. This is a promising attempt to use the financial power of religious institutions to achieve principles of equality and brotherhood which they espouse.

—Mary Louise Marple

"He's my brother; Let us live in peace."

—Elton John

THALASSA

A crazed sand crab
Tripped from the hot sand
Into the surf
When we made love
In a foot of water
By the shore.
We,
Beaten by foam waves
And caught for a moment
An impression in the
Sand.

Then I
Made my
Embryonic journey
To
The
Bottom
Striking the hard
To be made a pearl in
Some oyster's mouth.
A cold
Womb.

-- Brian H. Childs

SEMINARY FINANCES AND STUDENT ACTIVITY

Are you aware that:

> Bequests and gifts given to the Seminary are considered a sacred trust. The Finance Committee is careful to observe always the terms of each gift and fulfill the wishes of each donor, once the gift has been accepted by the Trustees.
>
> The guiding goal and purpose of the Finance Committee is to achieve superior investment performance in terms of more safety, more income and more capital growth. This is a difficult and complex task. Success in this work enables the Seminary to educate students who pay only a small fraction of the cost and it encourages generous donors to make additional gifts.
>
> Members of the Committee are diligently sought who have proven records of investment. These men, clergymen, and laymen, give of their time and talent freely without cost to the Seminary. These experienced Christian laymen and ministers prayerfully consider the wishes of donors, trustees, alumni, and churches, and welcome helpful suggestions from all sources. By long tradition, each meeting is opened by prayer for God's guidance.
>
> While the income from invested funds is an important item in supporting the Seminary program, the Committee, with the support of the Board, also seeks the substantial advantage of capital growth.
>
> The Committee with the support of the Board has invested in programs which net the Seminary less income and capital growth, doing so in order to help poor nations, black business, new churches, world food production, integrated housing, retirement homes, professor's housing, married student housing, etc. For generations the Committee has avoided holding securities of any companies primarily dealing in products which cater to human weaknesses or which lead to the dehumanization of man.
>
> For best investment results, the Committee's policy is flexible and unrestricted. The proportion of common stocks may vary between 20% and 90%. With the help of investment experts, superior securities are sought in many nations.
>
> —— Statement of Policy of Finance and Investment Committee, June 1970

The above policy statement of Princeton Seminary's Finance and Investment Committee, the select members of the Board of Trustees who deal exclusively with the investments and capital holdings of the seminary, is offered here as a means of encouraging student participation in the "sacred trust" of the handling of the endowment upon which all of us draw in some form or another. We of the Task Force on Priorities began last year with a concern over the seminary's role in contributing to and supporting in reality the war machine which it opposed in theory and stated "position". The statements of moral concern and righteous indignation concerning the war in Southeast Asia come as dramatic flourishes by members of the administration at key rallies and demonstrations. Meanwhile, behind the scenes, the seminary continued to grind along as the well-oiled and securely supported institution that it is. Our question was not why the seminary remained so well endowed in the face of so many critical issues, but rather we were concerned with the implications of <u>how</u> that security was amassed and of the way in which it was being used.

"Our institutions and the rules governing them no longer promote the best interests of anyone, including those who keep them stagnant for personal gain. Churches and Synagogues fear the reality of the Scriptures and fear living them; universities undertake war-related research, even as they refuse to lead the young; business puts profit over human life and welfare, while legislatures are filled with those who, for the most part, are vote-getters rather than critics of war policy and servants of human welfare." These words are taken from a sermon by Daniel and Phillip Berrigan, smuggled out of jails in which they are held. In many respects, they summarize our position in relation to the economic

position of this seminary and in response to the actions and attitudes of its President and his Board of Trustees. We object to the representation of a so-called Christian body by individuals whose primary goals are economic "safety, more income, and more capital growth." We object to the "diligent" selection of only individuals who represent that frame of thought and values to the Board of Trustees. And we object to the particular manner of accumulation of capital which this seminary utilizes, namely relying on some of the biggest and most destructive corporations in the world for that "capital growth."

We recognize that many students do not feel our sense of urgency in this matter. We are aware that many of you do not agree with the Berrigans that "contemporary peacemaking must go far beyond acknowledgement of failure of one's God and one's community; it must resist the powers of this world, the institutions of domination and their chieftains, whose wealth and positions give them staggering control over the resources of the world and the lives and deaths of human beings" or that such a resistance should include a confrontation of our own institution's involvement in that process. But a review of our venture reveals some facts of procedure, as well as of resource, which should alert all of us to the extremes of control exerted by President McCord and the Board, and to the denial of significant student activity which resulted from those extremes. First of all, consider that it took us over three months to simply obtain a list of the seminary's investments. It took a continual barrage of physical presence and verbal requests before we were finally given the list, along with firm words and a good pat on the head by Harry Kuch, the chairman of the Finance and Investment Committee. In the spring, after months of research into several of the seminary's holdings, we had prepared a careful report of our findings and their implications. We also had determined that, again considering the urgency we felt surrounding these economic affairs and the general lack of student voice in these or other governmental issues in the seminary, we would also present a proposition that students be included on the Board. Unfortunately it took an action of force, blocking the exit of the meeting room, before the Trustees would even consider the proposal directly, rather than begin its usual endless pattern of co-optation and delay through its special committees. Even then they exhibited their skill and persistence of avoidance; the spokesman for the Association of Black Seminarians repeatedly returned the question of whether the Board members agreed in the principle of student representation on the Board. Silence was the constant reply, but Floyd's persistence in pressing for some sort of response above their evasive tactics drew a few positive statements, agreeing that students should indeed be on the Board and that action should be taken to incorporate them into that body as soon as possible. But the majority remained firm in their refusal to give any sort of direct response and eventually managed to succeed in having it put off to committee.

We of the Task Force of Priorities conceded our time and effort on the financial issues in the Board meeting because of the greater importance we saw in establishing some direct student participation in this facet of the seminary's decision-making process. The Trustees and President McCord were firm in their determination to block even such a minimal threat to their concentration of power. Their actions this fall have been consistent with that determination. After a summer of meetings of the "joint" committee of students and Trustees, a recommendationemerged which in itself deleted direct student participation on the Board. But even this was significantly restricted and watered down at the Board's October meeting to render it vastly superficial, token, and non-concessive. At a meeting of the student body, the students present responded to the insignificance of this action and voiced their displeasure at the Board's poor faith by rejecting all of the proposals except the one which allowed students to sit in, without vote or voice, on the committee meetings of the Board. As a final note on the Board's avoidance of dealing with students, it seems significant that they have moved their spring meeting from May, as is called for in the by-laws, to June.

I offer the above as the brief history of a group of students who sought to interact with Princeton Seminary's Board of Trustees on two related issues which we considered extremely important, and of that body's response. This fall we have continued our work on the subject of the seminary's endowment and the implication of its particular activity in the machinery of corporate investment. We are working with widening resources as we interact with other groups who question the corporate "rationale" to discover the factual activity

of those companies in which the seminary invests. We continue to uncover disturbing realities in that search (which will be more specifically discussed in further publications), and, as we compare the facts to "policy", we find it ironic and contradictory, if not downright humorous, that the Finance and Investment Committee carefully "avoids" holding stock in tobacco and alcoholic beverage industriesbecause they are "primarily dealing in products which cater to human weaknesses or which lead to the dehumanization of man," but see but see nothing applicable to that policy in investing in companies such as American Telephone and Telegraph, which holds the sole contracts for development of Nike missiles, or utilizes a bank, Manufacturers' Hanover Trust, which continues to be one of the major financial backers of the white racist government of South Africa. What exactly do our men dealing in "sacred trust" mean when they say they are avoiding the dehumanization of man? And to what extent are their glorious sounding liberal efforts "to help poor nations, black business, etc., etc." reflective of their overall policy and direction? What percentage of the funds are invested in such enterprise, how valid are they, and how much of a sacrifice do they pose for this institution?

The answer to these and other such questions are unavoidable to concerned students. As we did last year, we have requested to see the complete portfolio of the seminary, including a breakdown of shares held in each corporation, value of stock, and breakdown of included sub-contracts. We requested this portfolio in order to take a closer look at some of these crucial questions. As last year, we were refused, given some flimsy and superficial excuses by President McCord, amounting to nothing more than it was not their "policy" to let it be seen.

We of the Task Force cannot help wondering about the priorities of our Board of Trustees and President McCord. We cannot help wondering amidst the erection of Erdmann Hall and the vast property holdings of the seminary where there is visible any concept of this institution as a "suffering servant" to the problems of war, poverty, and oppression which plague this nation. And we cannot help but question the validity of an economic policy which strives first and foremost to protect and increase the propertied interest of this seminary. But most of all we raise the question to you, our fellow students, and to those men what does our Board of Trustees have to hide or to fear in allowing students to see how the seminary's money is being spent? At a time when students at many institutions are asking questions similar to ours and have been granted the right to such information (Andover-Newton in Boston is a prime example among seminaries), we urge you to consider these issues, to evaluate for yourselves the implications of our Christian body's top-secret handling of financial affairs, and to support us in our search for creative alternative to the destructive qualities of an institution supposedly based primarily on faith.

--- Levering Bartine Sherman

"Look at me, who am I s'posed to be,

Who am I s'posed to be?

Look at me, what am I s'posed to be,

What am I s'posed to be...?

--- John Lennon (and me too...)

McGRUTHER'S THING

To be made with — made of whatever you might
whatever your might
The price might be right
For
Contemporary saintliness
can't be less
than what your value desires
brought to breath by
professional sires
on beautyrest mattresses
covered with week-old sheets and
orgasmic messes
From middle-of-the-Johnny-Carson-show urges.
when believe it or not: love was made
believe-it-or-not love: was made
believe it or not: you was made
believe-it-or-not you: was made.
"A boy! Sonnuvabich! Whadayah know!
A boy. Son of a bitch. What do you know?
What do you know?
What do you know?
"I know plenty," says three-year-old kid, with
a dimple sort of Face, and
a pimple sort of Feeling (ready to be squeezed,
or is it squozed —
who knows?)
"I know a clean, white, sterile, cold-as-hell
delivery room with giant, white, rubber-handed men
and my anathesiated mama and a slap on the bum."

"I know all kinds of things
that there's no point telling you."

— Douglas McGruther

FILM REVIEWS

Brewster McCloud--

This entertaining and poignant film is a facinating experiment in satire and allegory -- the point of which Hollis Alpert of Saturday Review regretably missed. At first glance Brewster McCloud may seem like another one of those goddamn-youth-exploitation flicks complete with dewey-eyed, martyred hero, but in fact its intricate composition is reminiscent of fine neo-classical satire. That expert in slap-stick and comic macabre, Robert Altman (M*A*S*H), updates the Greek myth of Icarus setting it deep in the infinite, sterile chambers of the Astrodome in Houston, the archtypal city of American plasticity (not that it is any worse than any other nouveau riche, urban situation). Our appallingly innocent and amoral hero,Brewster, himself a kind of rare avis, attempts to soar like Shelley's skylark in pursuit of the immortal spirit of art symbolized by flight.

With the aid and guidance of a maternal muse, Sally Kellerman, Brewster studies birds in flight and wing structure, builds up his body, and constructs a full set of wings. When Brewster encounters the hostile Houston community, his hapless, would-be squelchers mysteriously drop dead, their still-warm bodies plastered with guana. The intricate multiplicity of themes, ie. the amorality of art for art's sake versus the destructive materialism and stagnant sentimentality of society, constitutes an elegant contrapuntal cinematic exercise.

Brewster McCloud far surpasses Altman's previous enterprise M*A*S*H; it contains a much more unified plot, and the slap-stick and black humor seem better utilized in better relationship to the whole movie. With praiseworthy photography and cinematography Altman successfully satirizes American infatuation with pornographic idealism and fashionable materialism while brilliantly destroying the crumbling facades erected by pseudo-James Bonds, tuned-in youth, power-playing politicians, red-neck police investigato and withering aristocrats.

-- M.C.M.

TWO REVIEWS OF MINUS 2

The difficulty in reviewing Minus 2, an initial 8mm cinematic effort by Princeton's resident film-maker C.V. Scaborelli, is that there exists a difference between interpretat and criticism. The remark I wish to make concerning Scaborelli's film falls into the former category rather than the latter. Interpreting a film or any other work of art is naturally an ambiguous affair, as well as a highly personal one, whereas artistic critici although far from submitting to certainty, is still an area where two or three minds can hope to reach agreement.

Naturally, there is a good deal to be criticized in Scarborough's first film - poor photography attributable to poor equipment and a shaky hand, a tendency to lean towar a questionable romanticism - but those are faults which maturity may cure or, at least, ameliorate. The point I wish to make regarding the interpretation of the film is this: the climactic nude scene in which a man and a woman meet and escape together should not be taken as the most important or revelatory scene in the film. I am afraid that it will be. Admittedly, it makes a nice ending, even if a bit romantic, but it neither pulls the meanings of the cinematic poem together nor lends sense to the remainder of the film. The scene which does accomplish this is the scene in which man alone strides across a barren field to the tune of chaos, and this is a scene which may be neglected by its viewers. Without this crucial scene Minus 2 degenerates either into a nice collage of images or int effete sentimentalism. It is because Scarborough is capable of writing such a scene that I look forward to his next film and, hopefully, the one after that.

-- J.W.J.

Minus Two, an enterprising short film by the rising king of underground cinema C.V. Scaborelli, is the definitive theological statement of the year. Borrowing themes from Feuerbach, D.H. Lawrence, and God knows where else, the director skillfully portrays the plight of twentieth century man in conflict with his church, government, and compromising society.

Set in the placid elysian fields of Rocky Hill, N. J., Mr. Scaborelli dextrously explores the wilds of primeval man which exist somewhere in us all. This film is definitely not for the prudish who wince at the beauty of the nude human body.

Mr. Scaborelli states that there are a host of god images to which only a perverted society still adheres. He employs the institutional church, the Blessed Virgin, God the Father in primeval awesomeness, the military, and the "Bitch Goddess" of material success symbolized by an oil company, an automobile dealership, and a clothing store. All this perversion ultimately leads to death and destruction, but Mr. Scaborelli furnishes us with a cathartic ending which please Pasolini and Mathew Arnold, both.

Minus Two is a fine first film by a promising new director and is a must for the disillusioned seminarian.

— M.C.M.

VIEWPOINT

Special Post-Xmas Issue

VIEWPOINT

Volume 8, Number 4 March 12, 1971

PRINCETON SEMINARY as COMMUNITY

P.T.S. AND THE CHURCH of CHRIST

CHURCH PRIORITIES: a survey

PREJUDICE, POEMS, and more

VIEWPOINT Volume 8, number 4 March 12, 1971

With this issue begins a new semester of VIEWPOINT. Our first issue revolves around the question of Princeton Seminary as community. Under the aegis of Jean Swope, we will present viewpoints all semester as she states in her first article. John Wilde brings us a plea for church renewal within community, while Dan Consla outlines some common community gripes and John Fischer deals with an interesting slant on prejudice within the Seminary community. Finally we publish the results of a community-wide survey conducted by Jeff Faue and Dean Hoge. In between are some variegated comments about life-in-general. -jws.

VIEWPOINT is an informal journal of opinion that welcomes contributions from the entire Seminary community. The editors reserve the right not to print or to defer publication of all submitted works. Each contribution represents the author's own opinion and should be considered accordingly.

STAFF

Jim Slicer, Editor
Jean Swope, Community Editor
John Wilde, Associate Editor
Bruce Cameron
Bob Craig
Ken Gallagher
Billy Spenser
Glenn Weaver
Moses Yao

CONTENTS

Princeton Seminary and the Church of Christ..... John Wilde p.3

Community:Fact and Fiction..... Jean Swope p.4

An Open Letter..... Daniel Consla p.5

Prejudice at P.T.S.?..... John A. Fischer p.6

Asking Questions:The Domain of Theology..... Rev. Gil Gamesh p.7

Fragments..... Tom Taggart p.8

Views of Laymen and Seminary Seniors on Priorities of the Church. Hoge and Faue p.8

Prunes Were Meant to Stew..... Irene Tokar p.10

PRINCETON SEMINARY AND THE CHURCH OF CHRIST

by John Wilde

Hear judgment Princeton Seminary community from one of your alienated members. Now that a quiet, meditative, and confusing fall has passed, perhaps it is time to look seriously and angrily at our own community in relation to the church and the world which it seeks to serve.

I am angry because of some of the vicious flaws pervading this community. I think that almost all of them can be attributed to the unwillingness of this community to decide to be the church. This irresponsible decisional process is slowly killing us despite great teachers, great students, and other great resources. I don't want to be killed here and I don't want to see the church die because talented people of faith are not adequately prepared for churchmanship.

What are some of the symptoms of this failure? I submit that people are not loved here. Due to this many of us grow hardened, insensitive, and very negative toward the church. Some survive better than others but that can be no consolation to a supposed community of love. The tendency of this flaw is stagnation and immobilization. People who aren't loved are seldom motivated to take risks, to be creative, to pursue heightened goals.

Is a church too much to ask for of this Princeton Seminary community? Because I don't think it is, I would like to make a few proposals directed at the re-establishment of the community of faith, hope, and love here.

We must be willing to experiment. Not one or two or twenty of us, but all of us. This means that all of us must become radically open to alternative understandings of faith and alternative academic and practical programs. That is, let's stop shutting each other out. Let's even look for Christ in people and places and movements where we would least expect our liberator to be. We just might dare to look for abundant life and love in some of our seemingly insignificant members. Our Christianity is suspect if one member is left alienated, confused, or oppressed here. And our potential for creativity and fullness is crushed.

Strategies and tactics, plans and covenants, are required if we are to be intentional about being the church, agents of the mission of love, sensitivity, and responsiveness. Since this place is so stagnant and destructive of the spirit, should we not examine the effects of keeping people here three years before they can be inflicted upon the church? Perhaps two years, or even one, plus an internship year (with required continuing education) would be less dangerous to the church, at least until the seminary community takes seriously what it means to be the church once again. One positive result of this would be to lessen the serious lay-clergy split which is destroying the church.

Meanwhile those of us in the community who decide not to inflict ourselves on the church until we know what it means to be churchmen, whether administration, faculty, or students, could begin to work out a serious program of experimental churchmanship life-style seminars, workshops, courses, practicums, etc. in a disciplined manner. Some of us could even decide to live together as an extended family. With such radical re-formulation I have no doubt that God would begin to act decisively for the renewal of this seminary and, thereby, the church.

Most of us have big egos. If we didn't, we would probably not have decided to consider the ministry of God. Big egos are fine when they are submitted to God's will. One way to accomplish God's will here would be to build a community which excludes no one, where we decide to take responsibility for every one, even becoming a part of everyone else. Covenant renewal, radical experimentation and reformulation, could do it for us here. Let's think about it, pray about it, and even covenant to do something about it. I, for one, could accept responsibility for the future of the church at this seminary were there only colleagues for support.

****

COMMUNITY: FACT OR FICTION

J.A. Swope

Community is:

A) a unified body of individuals with common interests living in a particular place
B) an interacting population of various individuals in a common place
C) a fellowship
D) all of the above
E) none of the above

Princeton Seminary is:

A) a community
B) not a community
C) not sure what it is

Israel believed firmly that God was present and active in the world and that he had invited them into a covenant relationship. The relation of Israel to God was not that of a slave but that of a "first born son" who had been graciously redeemed by God. Gratitude for this deliverance was the primary motive for Israel's response of faith. And that faith took the form of obedience to God's Law and of living by the promise that he would go with them into the future. This covenant relationship was the basis of the Israelite community.

The community that produced the New Testament was bound by a new covenant based on an inner and personal communion with God rather than on external obedience to a written code of laws. This community began in an age of social, political, philosophical and religious conflict. Old patterns of their society were breaking up, society was unpredictable and full of hostile forces, and the people of the New Testament world sought security in a group bound by common concerns and aspirations. The sought for true community, i.e., for community of interest, for a common destiny and for a sense of belonging. The writer of Acts tells us (2:43-47 and 4:32-37) that the disciples enjoyed an intense community of spirit. They were together in worship and missionary activity; they ate together and they pooled their economic resources.

2000 years later.....Princeton Seminary.....what binds this community together, if in fact, there is community here? Everyday we hear people talking about the Princeton Seminary community. What are they talking about? Is there community here? If so, what binds it together? This column invites your comments on the nature of community, or lack of it, at the Seminary, and in successive issues of Viewpoint will try to assess "community" as issues arise that affect the various constituencies of the Seminary. Your comments will help us decide....Princeton Seminary community: Fact or Fiction?

****

***** COMING ATTRACTIONS*****

Women and the Church ....by Olive Haynes ....a woman's view of Barth's attitude toward the fairer sex.

What's Going On Here?....by Lev Sherman ....an analysis of the Trustee-student questions of the past semester.

.....plus a view of African missions by Tim Njoya, and a roundtable on the pros and cons of COCU. Incidentally, we need a "pro" article, and will welcome a contribution from within the Seminary if it is submitted by Monday, March 15. The article should deal with the advantages of supporting COCU.

AN OPEN LETTER

After a year and a half at this seminary, I have reached a few pertinant observations about it which I need to express. I preface my remarks by saying that I am not the type who usually rocks the boat. I don't complain to professors, although my friends often hear me moan. I don't try to bother our administrators too much, even when they bother me quite a bit. I would like to consider my following comments constructive criticism, and while I hope that they will be taken as such, I freely admit that they are more in the nature of complaints, which I feel are justifiable as such.

Item #1. Most of the faculty, with a few notable exceptions, are unable to relate their special knowledge to much beyond their own narrow field. They go through the motions of teaching their discipline with little regard for integrating it with the student's needs and other interests. One glaring example of the kind of myopia I am attempting to characterize is the fact that most of the faculty either lack a variety of parish experience or have none at all. Another sort of example of the same sort of myopia is the tendency to resist stretching their minds beyond their normal discipline. With one exception, none of the homiletics faculty has seriously considered the relavance of modern communications theory to their field. I have heard of professors who have been so resistant to accomodating insights from areas of study other than their own that they have down-graded students who have attempted to do so in meeting course requirements. In short, we lack a faculty which is willing to learn with the seminarian.

Item #2. The grading system is worse than obsolete. It is damaging both to initiative and to the student's sense of worth. It invites the student to capitalize on his areas of competence in order that he may keep up his grade average, rather than encouraging him to broaden himself by venturing into new and different areas of study. This results in either the student being as myopic as his professors or the student anxiously inquiring after one more "cake course" at registration time. If students are to be graded on the course required work at all, that grade should at least take into account his previous familiarity with the coure's subject matter. Case in point: languages such as Greek and Hebrew are taught and graded in such a way as to discourage most the student who does not have a good language aptitude. The result of this is that the student who needs the most encouragement in developing language skills gets the least encouragement, and avoids bothering with this whole area of education if he can. Thus grading according to relative merit encourages the scholar who needs the least encouragement, the student with a high language aptitude, and denies it to the one who most greatly needs it, the student with a low language aptitude.

To make this matter of grading even worse, some professors not only consider it an unwelcome chore but treat it as such. Thus they comply by allowing only one grade for the semester, based on a paper or test which usually has little bearing on what the student has gained in his course. This puts the student in a very tenuous position, for he has only one chance. To top it off, the very same professors who allow themselves the conveniently minimal chore of having to determine only one grade for each student are those who do their grading in a cavalier fashion. They illegibly scribble their comments on the cover without at least providing substantiation of them for the students' enlightenment.

Item #3. The emphasis of most courses is not on learning but on teaching. This observation is closely allied to the previous two. Nonetheless, it is worth separate mention. I will concede that some of the professors attempt to encourage independent scholarship in in their course planning and presentation. But I intend to suggest something far more radical than this. I contend that the classroom method wastes time and effort. If the professor could give the reading assignments and the lectures, which often never change from year to year, in printed or tape form, the student could be much more economical in his use of time. At the end of a few weeks, the students could meet with the professor for a series of discussions which were based on what had already been digested. This method could only be applicable to certain kinds of courses, this is true. But it would be a considerable improvement over the usual classroom routine, for both the student and the professor. The

greatest virtue of such a program is that it allows the student to be responsible for his own learning.

Item #4. The pettiness of administrative red tape and financial preoccupations can only inhibit the student's ability to study well. If he has to obtain part-time employment in order to pay the bills, he can hardly be expected to fulfill his scholastic potential. This is compounded all the more by excessive tuition increases, extra charges for not being able to meet the rent due date or parking tickets when one is not able to find an approved parking place (because there aren't enough). It is financially unfeasible for most married students who live at Princeton-Windsor Apts. to own two cars, but it is practically necessary. I have heard dozens of these persons ask why some kind of mini-bus or shuttle service to the campus isn't available, but I have never heard the query reasonably answered. To make such changes would in no way threaten the maintainance of this institution; they would take a considerable amount of frustration and time wasting from the student's burdens.

Item #5. The seminary program should be restructured so that the student could graduate six months or more earlier. Why not use the seminary's facilities to their fullest capacity all year round? The only sound reasons for the present structure of the three year program are that it is based on a traditional school year and that changes are hard to make. If the old structure were abandoned, the student's prolonged adolescence could be shortened, allowing him quantitatively more self-responsibility, and the burden he places on his family and the seminary could be abbreviated. This could allow for a restructuring of the field work and intern year programs, which may be needed.

Item #6. There is a lack of fellowship in the seminary community, at least compared to what one might anticipate. One can barely help but wonder where Jesus is in it all. This is something which must be of primary concern to each of us and each of us must seek to overcome it. However, this responsibility rests more heavily on the permanent members of this community than on its transient members, for it is they who contribute most greatly to setting the atmosphere and tone of the institution.

In conclusion, I feel that it is possible to go through Princeton Seminary with no more to show for one's time, money and efforts than being approved for the professional rites of passage. Is it true that you get out of it what you put in? Do you feel short-changed?

--by Daniel L. Consla
M. Div. , Middler

****

PREJUDICE AT P.T.S.?

John A. Fischer

Let's face it--we're all against racial prejudice. There aren't too many of us who will be wearing a Wallace button in '72. Our affirmations of black and brown equality are really great and a step forward for man, but we haven't gone far enough in getting rid of our prejudice. Around P.T.S. one of the biggest prejudice-areas is that of theological prejudice. We pre-judge those who don't agree with us. We toss aside Tillich if we're conservative. We toss aside an Inter-Varsity book if we're liberal. We go through seminary criticizing Richard Niebuhr or Saul Alinsky or Carl McIntire. Because of our prejudice we glibbly laugh them off and rarely listen to <u>them</u> as people who might have something for our benefit. I must confess that I'd rather read or listen to or study under someone who agrees with <u>me</u>, but this often subtle prejudice negates the whole education process, doesn't it? If dialogue has any meaning around here then it must be undertaken in an arena of openness and a lack of theological prejudice. Now openness isn't a weak mind who buys whatever is said like a "yes" man in business, but is an openness to listen to the other person as a person and not casting him off as full of "bull shit" for not agreeing with me. Man, I'm prejudiced and it's frustrating. How about you?

ASKING QUESTIONS: THE DOMAIN OF THEOLOGY

by

Rev. Gil Gamesh '66

To my pastor's office the other day came one of my parishioners--a young man working in an advertising agency. He had been raised in my church (the Second Presbyterian) and had of late become interested in what God had to say about the various burning theological issues: inflation, admission of Red China to the United Nations, the election, the draft--especially the latter since he had just gotten his notification for his physical. I was pleased to find that he had suddenly felt called to the ministry. I remember sitting behind my big desk smoking my pipe (Princeton '66) as he asked, "Rev. Gamesh--just what is the duty of theology?"

Saying nothing, I slowly blew a smoke ring that wafted like a halo in the sunlight. At my silence he grew slightly nervous and stuttered again,

"I mean, how exactly does a Christian--I mean 'a minister'--handle the great moral issues of our times?

I surveyed my fingernails and stroked my beard.

"Have I annoyed you?" he finally gasped, non-plussed.

"Oh not at all", I replied pleasantly. "You see I am answering your question. Today theology no longer pretends to have the answers--on the contrary the beauty, power, and thrust of theology is that... (he was on the edge of his seat now)...it asks questions!" I finished dramatically and sat back triumphantly to enjoy his reaction.

It was a bit disappointing--a mere "huh?" with an uncomfortable and rather ignorantly bewildered gaze for an aspiring man of the cloth.

So I went on to explain, "Historically, Christians have lost touch with their times by being far too dogmatic--too smug about having all the answers. Most notable, or notorious, of these, is you will, was John Wesley who was so far out of touch with the "stuff", the "nitty-gritty inner city event" of his time that he forced a spiritual and social reform upon it that it obviously did not want. This is the kind of thing that gave the early church such a bad press. Rather, I think theology should act as a sounding board for other disciplines--the cinderella, if you will, of the arts, "he who would be greatest must serve", and the "last shall be first." The best example of this in our unique and normative guide, the "Holy" Scriptures, discounting such failures as Peter, Paul, the apostles and most of Jesus' ministry (whose stories are all probably redacted anyway) is the wonderful example of our Lord standing before Pilate at his trial. As a sheep before his shearers he was dumb. Pilate asked him again and again, "Are you the king of the Jews?" "Are you the Son of God?" "What is Truth?" Why did Jesus remain silent? Because--you see--he was forcing Pilate to do Theology! Pilate was asking questions. This is why Jesus came and died. Remember how at his last moment of life he had them asking--"Why don't you come down off the cross..?'"

"But", he exploded, "why did he say then--'forgive them Father for they do not know what they do?'"

"Obviously a redaction by some scribe", I countered quickly.

Well as it ends up he decided to go to Canada but I had a brand new insight to try to use for my doctorate...

P.S. One thing I should add is that as he was rapidly backing out I capped it all by shouting triumphantly, "And that's the reason why Jesus has them and us all guessing what happened to the body!"

the end

FRAGMENTS
Tom Taggart

There is room in the wall for a hollow
There is blue in the green of the skies
There are day in the seconds
How often in the silence there are cries
Listen if you will to the quiet
and hear the dismal groans of my soul

With mystery like a chalice
Which is smashed on freedom's shore
And the echo of our drowning
Down the corridor of hope
Howls our tears into the darkness
And we fill it with our shrouds

Dismal in the darkness
We follow blind to hoping
And I swelter in the fire
As the Inquisition grows
And the pyre of my longing
Is scourged by my despair

When is dreaming like a purge?

When do eyes constitute a sacrilege of dawn?

****

(The following article is based on surveys done expressly for publication in Viewpoint. The work was done in April 1970, Dean R. Hoge and Jackson W. Carroll superving the the church surveys. Much of the work was done in a P.T.S. seminar whose members were Ronald Brockway, Jeffrey Faue, Donald Landis, Donald Luidens, Ronald Wallen, and Galen Yoder. The authors wish to thank the seminary seniors and laymen who co-operated in the study).

VIEWS OF LAYMEN AND SEMINARY SENIORS
ON PRIORITIES OF THE CHURCH

by Dean R. Hoge and Jeffrey L. Faue

In The Gathering Storm in the Churches, Jeffrey K. Hadden demonstrates that Protestant laymen and clergymen differ on many theological and social attitudes. Do they differ on the priorities they desire for the church? Recently identical questionnaires concerning the priorities of the church were filled out by laymen and seminary students.

The laymen are random samples of two United Presbyterian and two United Methodist suburban churches in the Philadelphia greater metropolitan area. All the churches have between 500 and 1000 members, and the social classes of the members are a mix of white collar and blue collar groups. A total of 515 responses were received, for a return rate of 68 per cent. Differences among the four churches were so small that they are ignored here. The student sample was comprised of all seniors in the M.Div. program at Princeton Theological Seminary in November 1970. Of the 104 questionnaires sent out, 85 were completed for an 81 per cent return rate.

The respondents were asked to read through a list of sixteen statements of goals and priorities of the church being advocated and discussed today. The respondents were asked to rate the importance and priority of each on a six-point scale, with 1 being

"very important; highest priority," and 6 being "very unimportant; lowest priority." Table 1 shows the mean (average) rating of each item and the ranking of the sixteen items. A low mean score indicates a high priority for the item. The "key words" in Table 1 were not in the questionnaire; they are added to the table for clarification.

(EDITOR'S NOTE: Due to the complexity of Table 1, our typist didn't want the hassle of reproducing it here. Xeroxed copies are available from the Viewpoint Office, basement of Stuart Hall).

In Table 1 the first column gives responses from the laymen, the second gives responses from all the seminary seniors, the third gives responses from all seniors definitely or probably entering the parish ministry after graduation, and the fourth gives responses from those seniors definitely not entering the parish ministry. A third group of seniors who are uncertain about their plans are not shown in the table. In addition we asked the students for their denomination and marital status. No differences were found between married and single students. The only denominational difference we found was that the students who were not Protestant or who lacked a denominational affiliation tended to rank item 11 (Social Judgments) a bit higher than other students.

Table 1 shows that the laymen's highest priorities are Religious Education, Preaching, Sacraments, and Fellowship, in that order. The items they see as lowest priorites are those stressing social action or social change—items 11, 10, 9, and 12. The items on which the laymen showed the greatest disagreement are 12 (Lobbying), 10 (Church Action), and 16 (Missions). The seminary students have different priorities. Highest for them are Counseling, Preaching, Religious Education, and Spiritual Guidance, in that order. Lowest for the seminary seniors are Missions, Music and Arts, Moral Standards, and Lobbying. The items on which the seminarians show the greatest disagreement are 16 (Missions), 6 (Moral Standards), and 12 (Lobbying). Given the present emphasis on worship and expression, we were a bit surprised to see the low priority given to Music and Arts by the seminarians.

When we compare the seniors entering the parish ministry with those not doing so, we see that the former give higher priority to Sacraments and Fellowship. The latter give higher priority to the items on social action.

Four of the sixteen items were written to assess support given to various doctrines of Christian social action. There is a current debate within the church as to whether the appropriate actor in Christian social action is (a) the individual Christian with an informed and sensitized social conscience or (b) the church acting as an organized body. The Presbyterian Lay Committee strongly advocates the former view. Also there is a debate today as to whether the most important object of the action should be (a) the individual person in need or (b) the total social system. The former is often labelled "humanitarian" or "charity" as distinguished from social reform. Table 2 shows the priorities given to items 7, 8, 9, and 10, which express each of the four logical options. Again in Table 2 low mean scores indicate higher priorities.

TABLE 2
LAYMEN AND SEMINARY SENIORS ON DOCTRINES OF CHRISTIAN SOCIAL ACTION
(average scores of items 7, 8, 9, 10)

		LAYMEN		STUDENTS	
		Who is the actor?		Who is the actor?	
		Individual	Church	Individual	Church
Who is the object of the action?	Individuals	2.39	2.61	2.59	2.32
	Society	3.34	3.46	2.32	2.23

The laymen give greatest support to individual action aimed at individual persons. They give least support to organized church action aimed at social reform. Note that the distinction between individuals as objects and society as the object is much more important an issue for the laymen than the distinction between the individual as an actor or the church as the actor. One would not have guessed this from reading the current debate about the church and social action.

The students made much smaller distinctions between the four kinds of social action, but when they did they reversed the priorities of the laymen so that organized church action aimed at social reform was given highest priority and individual action aimed at needy individuals was lowest. These priorities more accurately reflect the main emphases in seminary courses in social ethics and social action.

Another method of examining the data is the construction of indices out of several items. We constructed two indices, one measuring emphasis on social action and the other measuring emphasis on maintenance of strong congregational life. The Social Action Index was composed of items 9, 10, 11, and 12. The Congregational Life Index was composed of items 1, 2, 3, 5, 13, 14, and 15. The index scores are the means of the items. Table 3 shows the index scores and the difference between them.

TABLE 3
COMPARATIVE SCORES ON TWO INDICES

	Laymen	All Seniors	Parish Ministry	Not Parish Ministry
Congregational Life Index	1.72	2.09	2.00	2.47
Social Action Index	3.49	2.75	2.78	2.78
Difference	1.77	.66	.78	.31

All groups said that congregational life was more important than social action. For the laymen the difference in importance was large (1.77). For the seminary seniors the difference was smaller (.66). For the seniors not entering the parish ministry the two emphases were seen as almost equally important, with a difference of only .31.

This research may perhaps clarify some of the current discussion about differences within the church concerning its proper goals and priorities. The main difference between the suburban laymen and the seminarians is the higher priority given to social action and social reform by the latter. Whereas the laymen stressed evangelical missions and personal morality over social action, the seminarians stressed social action over evangelical missions and personal morality. An analysis of types of laymen will be done later.

PRUNES WERE MEANT TO STEW

"How come?"
She said, one Sunday morn,
While sitting in the pew,
"That ministers will always don
That morbid gown of black?"

Prunes were meant to stew.
We should not look like that.

God made the universe so beautiful:
Crimson, gold, cerise, and blue.
All things hath colour to their souls,
But man cannot be true.

"Let there be light," the good Lord said
A little time ago.
"No prunes in my home, if you please,
I would not have it so."

A dark green gown might just suffice
—a suit of tan or blue.
Joseph's coat had many colours.
What can we at Princeton do?

—Irene Tokar

VIEWPOINT

Volume 8, Number 5 April 2,1971

INSTITUTIONALIZED RELIGION AS MISSION

COCU: A QUESTIONABLE STEP by Billy Spencer and Bruce McDaniel

TRANSFORMATION OF MAN, I: FULL PARTNERS by Olive Haynes

AFRICAN POST-MISSIONARY CHURCH by T.M. Njoya

PLUS: POEMS, Rev. Gil Ganesh and MORE

VIEWPOINT Volume 8, number 5 April 2,1971

STAFF

Jim Slicer, Editor
John Wilde, Associate Editor
Bruce Cameron
Bob Craig
Ken Gallagher
Billy Spencer
Glenn Weaver
Moses Yao

* * * * * * *

INSTITUTIONALIZED RELIGION AS MISSION

This edition explores the everpresent question of the boundaries between mission and institution. Billy Spencer and Bruce McDaniel explore the COCU question (to which we welcome comments, as with all articles) while "A Public Correspondence..." reveals some tension areas between institution and individual mission. Rev. Gil Gamesh, our thought-provoking pipe smoker, returns with "another breakthrough in exegesis," that institution to which we all offer obeiance. Finally, Olive Haynes and Tim Njoya examine the unofficial Church institutions of Male Dominance and African Mission, respectively, from the "other" side: as a female, and as an African. Hopefully, white, male chauvinism may never be the same.Ha! In conclusion, John Glosser submitted two poems which smack of collusion with a well-known magazine publisher in New York. Nevertheless, as a Sporting Illustration of our FORTUNEate good will, we offer you "What is Life?" and "But Is There Time?" for your poetical perusal. -jws.

VIEWPOINT is an informal journal of opinion that welcomes contributions from the entire Seminary community. The editors reserve the right not to print or to defer publication of al submitted works. Each contribution represents the author's own opinion and should be considered accordingly.

CONTENTS

Full Partners..... Olive Haynes p.3
COCU: A Questionable Step..... Spencer and Mc Daniel p.4
Silver Lining?..... A.Clark Wiser p.5
A Public Correspondence Between William R. Johnson, Jr. and Dr. Daniel L. Migliore..... p.6
What Is Life? and But Is There Time?..... John Glosser p.9
Judeo-Dude..... Rev. Gil Gamesh p.10
African Post-Missionary Church: Its Guerrilla Ministry..... T.M.Njoya p.10

FOR [illegible]THERS
by Clive D. Haynes

I am a Christian. I am a woman. Both of these facts influence my support of the current struggle of women for equal rights and responsibilities in society and their drive to become a participating, active force in the Christian Church. It is also from this perspective that I interpret the Karl Barth essay, Man and Woman. There is something deep inside me that rebels at Barth's strong emphasis on the subordinate role of women. I rebel because of a force that directs me to realize my potentialities, that causes me to want to learn, to build, to contribute to life and yes, in those areas in which I am strong, to lead. For me to be less than I am, and can be, for me to hold back and give less than my best, for me to merely follow when I am qualified to lead is for me to live a lie, it is for me a denial of my humanity for I would be less than honest in my relationships. Above all, for me, it is a denial of Christ.

I find that I react strongly to Barth when he writes: "The goodness and justice of the divine order are not transformed into evil and injustice even for those who have to suffer from its misunderstanding and abuse by others. Even then it is better that she on her side should not infringe but observe it." In short Barth is saying the woman is to maintain her place no matter what. It would seem to me that the goodness and justice of the divine order would be more fully realized if more were done to challenge and eradicate the misunderstandings and abuses that keep woman from realizing more fully her personhood.

In his essay, Man and Woman, Karl Barth comments on the accomplishments in the church. Naturally these accomplishments are attributed to men rather than women. There is, however, no indication that the reason for this might be the lack of opportunity for women to participate. One can only speculate at the price the church has paid for oppressing and suppressing women, and one can only wonder at the possible achievements for the church and all humanity, if the woman power in the church were emancipated from the coffee pot, the cookie tray and a wide variety of stereotyped duties. There are many women with special gifts and leadership abilities to offer in the name of Christ.

I have given careful consideration to the Genesis account of the fall and to the various scripture passages quoted by Barth, but I must also give equal consideration to such passages as Luke 10: 27,28: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your strength, and with all your mind;" and Ephesians 4:11: "And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers." If we look upon our gifts, in the church and outside the church, as gifts from God and if a woman is given special gifts, is she not defying the will of God if she does not develope her gifts and return them to her Creator via productive activity? Is she not wrong if she is content to merely adorn the earth? Should she not take the initiative to be creative, to plan, to build and yes, even to direct when what she does is in keeping with the scope of her talents and is, as far as she can humanly determine, in keeping with God's will?

Barth writes: "What God's command wills for men and women is that they should be faithful to their human nature and to the special gift and duty indicated by it." To this we can only add a hearty Amen! I'm sure, however, that we tend to interpret these words in a different way than Barth intended. We do not believe a woman can be faithful to her human nature unless she develops and uses her talents and abilities. We believe it is her duty to do this and furthermore we believe she can do it without sacrificing her uniqueness as woman.

Perhaps we would do well in our consideration of man-woman relations to consider scripture other than the Genesis account of the fall and the usual passages attributed to Saint Paul. If we examine the priestly account of the creation as related in Genesis 1:27 we see that the image of God, in which mankind was created includes both male and female. What God is, therefore, encompasses both sexes, so none of us, male or female is complete in himself. We must have the opposite sex to help us to form an image of God, sketchy though it may be. When one sex is not permitted to realize full humanity, by participating openly and fully in relationships, both sexes suffer in their relationship to each other and in their relationship to God.

For the Christian Church to deny women their rights and responsibilites as human beings in the church and for the church to fail to work for the equality of women in society, is to deny the atoning sacrifice of Christ Jesus.

Christ died for all the world, male and female. Salvation is a freely offered gift to all who receive Christ, and we make a mockery of His gift if we say (and we are not accusing Karl Barth of saying this) that half of mankind must work out their salvation in the biological function of child bearing and in subjugation of their desires and God-given talents to the desires of those in control. Christ gives to women their intended place in the divine order.... full partnership in reflecting the image of God.

****

COCU: A Questionable Step
by Billy Spencer and Bruce McDaniel

Theoretically, the Church of Christ Uniting seems to be an option that should thrill every Christian. The necessity for unity is a theme each Biblical Christian should stress, as Paul does in I Corinthians 1, emphasizing the foolishness of divisions within a body of believers, and Jesus himself has done in his prayer recorded in John 17, "Holy Father, keep them in thy name, which thou hast given me, that they may be one, even as we are one." (RSV) However, sadly the plan of COCU as it now is developing looks very little like an answer to this problem of differences.

Now we realize at the outset that for one to speak against this apparent move for solidarity on a campus as warmly community-minded as Princeton makes one feel as though he were the only SDSer at a YAF rally, or a WCC executive at "The Christian Admiral", or Kate Millet at a Norman Mailer testimonial. Yet, the goal of true Biblical Christian Community does not seem to be inherent in the COCU framework as it now stands.

We once remember hearing of a Junior High student who was asked to read I Corinthians 1 for devotions in Sunday School. The way he stumbled through it was, "I appeal to you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you agree and that there be no denusions among you..." We think this is a first observation about the drawbacks of COCU as it stands.

COCU's assumption is that the only effective form for the body of Christ is a single organization. As the planners express it:

> As the world looks at us now, it is unimpressed by our claim to love one another, for it sees how we are fractured and divided by lesser loyalties.
> ("A Plan of Union", II,3)

Yet the assumption that organic union is necessary to the health of the body of Christ and the doing of his work in the world can be questioned. Does structural variation hopelessly hinder the Spirit of God? For example, was the monolithic Roman system more fruitful than the diverse reformation churches? Our point herein is simply to ask: is structural union among Christians the prime requirement for Church renewal and outreach, or are there other factors that have proved decisive in the great historic advances in Christ's work?

In addition, the plan of union seeks to preserve the essential beliefs and practices of all the member churches.

> ...we envisage a united church, embodying all that is indispensable to each of us, and bearing enough family resemblance to our separate traditions to verify their continuity in it, yet unlike the churches any of us has known in our past separateness. (II, 7)

Unfortunately, the inevitable result is theological vagueness. One example is, in its synthesizing, COCU ends up with what seems to be a doctrine of universalism. "In his death, all men die; and as he was raised from the dead, all are given new life." (III,13). This is a non-Biblical doctrine, negated by such explicit statements of Jesus as, "He who believes in the Son has eternal life; he who does not obey the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God rests upon him." (John 3:36); "Enter by the narrow gate; for the gate is

wide and the way is easy, that leads to destruction, and those who enter by it are many. For the gate is narrow and the way is hard, that leads to life, and those who find it are few." (Matt. 7:13,14) Moreover, the relation of baptism and salvation is not clear, and neither for that matter is the position of the Scriptures.

> The united church acknowledges the unique and normative authority of the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments. The Scripture witnesses to God's revelation, fulfilled in Christ, and to man's response to that revelation. (V,4

The Scripture is not only a witness to God's revelation, but also to man's response to that revelation. Is it not possible that anything in the Scripture, other than the words of Christ himself, can be looked upon as a human response to revelation? In that case, all of the doctrine and history of the Scripture, other than the actual words of Christ, could be devoid of any supernatural authority whatsoever--and even the words of Christ, being recorded by others, would be a witness to human response to revelation, rather than a witness to revelation itself. Obviously some clarification is needed to explain how the Scriptures remain a "unique" and "normative" "authority."

If you follow these difficulties with a vague statement on the creeds (previously we have been dealing with the content of faith; this issue involves the standard for arriving at the content) the entire result is a kind of holy confusion.

Though there are other major points to consider, the final aspect of COCU which should be mentioned since up to this time it has received the bulk of criticism is the problem that an episcopalian structure, being more centralized than the organization presently employed in some of the member churches, limits the freedom and self-determination necessary to a vital church. A concentration of power at the top, as any SMNC member will affirm, leads to the control of the many by the few. August J. Kling has well expressed this fear in "The Presbyterian Layman" (Jan., 1971, p.4) when he writes,

> As we believe that God is best worshipped and served by free men and women, we favor those church structures that allow the greatest measure of orderly self-determination of laymen at the local level, and we resist all moves toward centralization that would tend to disenfranchise laymen in the local congregations where they gather for worship, nurture, and fellowship.

Thus the weary Christian pilgrim who longs ever for reunion with his brothers may feel that COCU is more a "peace in our time" measure than a decisive solution. For the sake of external union he would be compromising his principles and relinquishing much of his individual power, leaving himself but little voice with less to say.

****

SILVER LINING?

by A. Clark Wiser

The leader gazed around the board
And told the chieftains there,
"I fear, my friends, that his is war;"
His face was creased with care.

The common soldier grabbed his gun;
The sergeant seized his sword.
And once again the nations fought--
For peace is hard to hoard.

And all around the war-torn earth
The bombs began to fall,
Until one foolish nation dropped
The biggest of them all.

And all the other warring lands,
Forgetting consequence,
Let fly their super-weapons too;
They called it self-defense.

SILVER LINING? (continued)

And He who dwelt above looked down
Upon a lifeless earth.
He saw a land that nevermore
Would know a human birth.

But if there were no men, at least
There now would be a ban
On poets who would moan the mess
That "man had made of man."

(EDITOR'S NOTE: The following exchange of letters occurred over a month ago. They are printed with the permission of the authors. We publish them with the view that they reflect a commentary on the academic and political aspects of the admission and dismissal of students from a school which grapples with the message of Christ).

A PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN WILLIAM R. JOHNSON, JR. AND DR. DANIEL L. MIGLIORE

January 26, 1971

Dear Dr. Migliore:

It is after much soul searching that I take the time to write to you. The matters I will discuss with you are heavy upon my heart and I would do myself and you an injustice if I did not share them with you and your colleagues.

That I was summarily dismissed from my studies at Princeton Theological Seminary as a doctoral candidate came as both a shock and a revelation. As I indicated to you following the conference--if it can be classed as such--with Dr. McCord and Dr. Blizzard, I realized my failure to pass the language examinations would hinder me from consideration as a resident candidate. I did not know it would terminate my studies. I was hopeful--too much so--that perhaps I could continue my studies, complete all of my course requirements, and at that time concentrate totally on my languages. I know of other schools that have allowed such practices, particularly when the student was meeting the academic requirements of the school other than the languages.

One of the revelations this dismissal brought about was that Princeton Theological Seminary is both unwilling and unready to deal realistically with the uniqueness that black students bring with them to Princeton. This uniqueness stems from being in a "unique" place in our society and playing a "unique" role in this nation. Whether some of the so-called scholars of Princeton Theological Seminary agree or not, there is a difference in culture and personality of the American Black and the American white. That Princeton is unable to deal with these statements as fact explains why you and your doctoral studies committee were unable to deal realistically with my and my "problem." In our conversation you stated you had never heard that the examinations administered by the Educational Testing Service were culturally biased. As a professor at Princeton Theological Seminary and as the "Director" of one of the committees which must determine the qualities of minority group applications to the doctoral program, I am saddened by such admissions. If you can truthfully state that you had never heard of such findings and that you are not aware of any attempts on the part of ETS to make their examinations bias-free, then I submit that you are not qualified to serve as the "director" of any committee which must determine whether or not blacks and other minorities will or will not be admitted to Princeton Theological Seminary nor to any other institution of learning.

In our "post-conference" conversation, I also mentioned that I thought the entire doctoral committee--with few exceptions--represented an antiquated concept to academic achievement. Princeton considers itself an institution offering a "classical" education.

I agree with this insightful classification, for like the classics no one is really concerned about it. People read classics basically to prove how much education they have, some few for enjoyment, but most keep copies of the classics around for "window dressing." Princeton is about to come to that state; for the most part its major role is to remind people of the times that once were; it serves as window-dressing. Like the classics, Princeton Theological Seminary represents times past and gone.

The one thing Princeton has not taken under consideration is the fact that education today must, if it is anything, be practical. Education today must be geared to serving a need. There are few so-called pure research scientists left. People today are not interested in education just for the sake of education. They are seeking tools by which they can become better whatever they seek to become. If education fails to meet these needs, if education proves to be more theoretical than practical, most students today are turned off. If they cannot relate what they are studying to what they are to become they either become drop-outs or marginal students (degree-ites), going through the motions of getting an education simply to obtain a degree from a "classical" institution. Princeton Theological Seminary refuses to adjust itself to this fact. Its roots are too deeply buried in the past to extract itself from the notions of education prevalent in the 18th and early 19th centuries.

I ask you again even as I asked the doctoral studies committee, my advisor and Dr. McCord, of what relevance is there in French or German for a student, regardless of race, who will be dealing with practical applications of sociological and theological concepts in an almost purely social setting? Where will I or anyone else need these or any other languages when dealing with the problems of racial injustices, de-humanization, and economic, political and religious oppression? What I need are the theories of sociologists, economists, theologians, etc., who speak to such issues. What I need, in these instances, are methods of ridding the society of such "sins"; what I don't need are languages that prevent me from achieving the goals I need to meet.

Princeton's refusal to enter the 20th century is further evidenced by its blatant rejection of guidelines issued by the American Association of Theological Seminaries (AATS), which have called for radical changes in curricula planning, admissions policies, etc. This rejection of these policies or guidelines come despite the fact that our own Dr. McCord is also leader of the AATS group.

What more can I say that I haven't already said? Can I conclude that Princeton Theological Seminary is a racist institution? Is it a fair judgment--not that P.T.S. is at all fair--to conclude that Princeton's inability or refusal to come to grips with the Black experience is due, primarily, to the leaders' inability and/or refusal to rid themselves of biases, prejudices and antequated concepts? It is a very sad commentary, but in the two years I have been here I have not seen evidenced, on the part of either the faculty or the administration, any genuine concern for the welfare and longings of the black students. In an article I wrote for VIEWPOINT my first year, I spoke to the racism evidenced here. Things have not gotten any better, perhaps worse.

As I take leave of Princeton and Princeton Theological Seminary, I leave without any hate in my heart. I leave somewhat disillusioned, however. Dis-illusioned because I had high hopes: first of receiving a doctoral degree from a "classical" institution; secondly because I had hopes that P.T.S., with its seeming-quest for truth, could break through the deep layers of racism, archaism and status quoism; thirdly, I'm dis-illusioned because P.T.S. has failed to become the influential insitution in these times that it once was in "classical" times. Princeton has lost its leadership simply because it has refused to lead. It has become self-satisfied; it wallows in its history; it sits upon its laurels and they wither and they die. Other seminaries with fresh insights and daring leaders are now in the fore front while Princeton Theological Seminary speaks of yesterday and what it once was and once did and who once walked upon its hallowed grounds.

To you, your committee, and to the seminary, farewell. Like Paul, I have fought a good fight, I've run my course here at Princeton, but above all I've kept the faith.

May the spirit of him who has come to set at liberty the captives (in mind, spirit, and body) and to lift up the oppressed, be with you now and always. Amen.

Struggling always for peace and power,

William R. Johnson, Jr. A.B., M.A., B.D., Ph.D., ???

February 4, 1971

Dear Bill:

Your candid letter of January 26, 1971, was very painful for me to read. No decision to which I have been party during my years at Princeton Theological Seminary has filled me with as much frustration and disappointment as the discontinuation of your doctoral candidacy.

Although I did not have the pleasure of working with you in a class or seminar, I have admired your great leadership ability and the moral passion and insight which you have contributed, through the ABS and in other ways, to the life of Princeton Seminary over the past two years.

Let me say first in reply to your letter that I am aware that all of the ETS examination programs reflect the cultural bias of our entire educational system in the United States. To my knowledge this has been fully recognized in the interpretation of test scores of overseas students and American blacks by the former Directors of Doctoral Studies, by myself, and by members of the Committee on Doctoral Studies. In several cases of which I am aware ETS exam scores have been completely disregarded as inaccurate measures of a candidate's academic potential. With regard to language exams in particular, the Graduate School Foreign Language Testing Program of ETS is not the only means Princeton Seminary currently uses in determining a student's reading ability in a foreign language.

The most basic question, however, which you raise in your letter is that of the relevance of any foreign language study for men like yourself who want to be engaged, both academically and practically, in the task of overcoming racial injustices, dehumanization, and oppression. Speaking for myself, I would argue that a useable reading knowledge of one foreign language should be accepted as sufficient in some areas of doctoral study. Some members of the Doctoral Studies Committee have informally discussed the possibility of substituting a research skill such as statistics for one of the required foreign languages in some areas of our doctoral program. With regard to the particular languages required, our present program allows students to substitute another modern foreign language for either German or French, should the alternative promise to contribute more to the student's intended program of study. As you may know, this option has been exercised by some of our doctoral students.

Whatever modifications our present program may require, I am convinced of the value of a reading knowledge of at least one foreign language in all areas of doctoral work. I would ask whether "the theories of sociologists, economists, theologians, etc.," which you say are important because they bear on the decisive issues of justice and human dignity in our day, are to come only from the English-speaking scholars and critics? Might that not lock us into conventional ways in which Americans view themselves and their society and rob us of the benefit of seeing how "outsiders" view us and our institutions? The point of foreign language study in a good doctoral program is precisely the liberation which it affords from provincial views and limited resources. I am sure that you know that some important studies on oppression from the Third World, such as Franz Fanon's Wretched of the Earth and Paulo Freire's Pedagogy for the Oppressed were available in the native languages of their

authors long before they were translated into English.

I suspect that in most matters our educational philosophies would be in agreement. I am as appalled as you are by the kind of sterile "classical" educational assumptions which you reject. So far as I can see we differ significantly on one point and one point only, and that is whether foreign language study makes a significant contribution to an open, self-critical, horizon-expanding educational experience. For the sake of a truly liberating education, at least at the doctoral level, I think we should refuse to assume that our native language puts us in touch with all of the resources we need in order to deal with the great social issues of our day. I think we need the help of people who have very different historical experiences, who see the human situation through different eyes and perhaps speak of it in a language different from our own.

I hope that you will not give up your goal of completing a doctoral program. I want again to offer you whatever help I can in your effort to realize this goal. Let me wish you God-speed in your present ministry.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Migliore
Director of Doctoral Studies

****

What Is Life?
by John Glosser

In the middle of it all
Take time to consider life
This amazing and mysterious maze

This moment to moment movement
What is it?
A little laughing
A little crying
A little hoping
Lots of loving
Lots of praying
Lots of working
Some thinking
Some grabbing of the wheel
Some being grabbed
By something of another type
Lots of looking
Very little seeing
Of anything but forms
A million strange elements
Unite, forming a trip to death
But these are fragmentary words
They are not the last word
And they cannot capture life
In this place all we can do
Is ask: What is life?
And wait for the answer
From something of another type.

But Is There Time?
by John Glosser

But is there time
Any time
left at all before
the sun blackens?
The young boy
asked me, a tear
in the corner
of his desperation.
Any time
for love
before the last day?
Any time
for peace
before hope blows away?
The boy's questions
hung in the air.
The sun began
to set and
I did not answer.

JUDERO-DUDE

by Rev. Gil Gamesh

(in partial fulfillment of the requirement
for the degree Doctor of Theology)

It has long been our temptation to accept, so to say, the naive presupposition that those writings which we now refer to as the Holy Scriptures descended from the very mouth of God, who is enthroned above the 3-storeyed universe. How easy it is for us to fall into the onerous pit of bibliolatry. But at last I have gained special knowledge, and, along with one or two other prominent scholars, I have been developing, using the valuable tools of the higher critical method of literary-historical research. the theory that the authorship of the epistle commonly known as "Jude" is the work of at least two, or possibly 17, authors of a diverse period of time ranging from perhaps the beginning of the 2nd century up to the age of Immanuel Kant and the Enlightenment.

For instance, the book, that is, the epistle as we know it, consists of four distinct pericopes. Verses 1-2 consist of a salutation of which we will have more to say later. Verses 3-16 contain references to false teachers, whoever they are, and verses 17-23 warnings and exhortations. 24-25 is a long benediction of which also we will have much to say later.

Now it is the thesis of this paper that vs. 3-16 bear the distinct stylistic characteristic of a man, or men, entirely different from vs. 17-23. For instance, although the word agapatoi begins both pericopes, the second pericope adds the words humeis de. This reveals a stylistic difference of so great a magnitude, that we are forced to conclude that the second paragraph was written by a different author than the first. This may be seen from the fact that the word may be translated "beloved" in the first, and "you, beloved" in the second. Just as in a later period in history, the greetings "you", and "you all," distinguish a northerner from a southerner, we may conclude that the first paragraph, employing only "beloved", was written in the Northern Kingdom and "you, beloved" in the Southern Kingdom of Judah, and at a later period, considering the Babylonian Captivity. We may term this southern, later author of the second paragraph "Deutero-Jude."

This argument is supported by the fact that a different subject matter is spoken of in the two paragraphs, and also by the fact that no less than twenty-five words appear in the second paragraph that are nowhere to be found in all of the first paragraph. QED

Now, as to the matter of the Salutation and Benediction. It is hardly necessary to mention the fact that these are mere trappings of the epistolary genre probably added in the 17th Century in the city of Konigsburg, Germany, possibly by the great Dr. Kank himself. More than this we kan't know. As is often the case in a learned discourse such as mine, I raise more questions than answers. But after all, what is the domain of Biblical studies but to raise questions? In the words of that learned musician Ludwig von Beethoven, which he uttered on his death-bed, "To compose is greatness, but to decompose is sublime."

****

AFRICAN POST-MISSIONARY CHURCH: ITS GUERRILLA MINISTRY

by T.M. Njoya

Under the conditions of missionary help and industrial domination, the African Church does not exist as a living body of Christ. Tautalogically it receives its name from the Western Church from which it emanated, in the same way the British Empire and American globalism extend themselves into the World without giving rise to new empires. This is done in accordance with the principles of religious and political extensions of the "sphere of influence" of the dominant powers. However, a complete disengagement of the African Churches from the western missionaries might not only end the domination of one system in other countries, but might create the need to develop new types of ministries.

Africa is a pre-modern continent as well as a pre-revolutionary sphere. She has to undergo all these changes at once and hence needs a modern revolutionary ministry. We

cannot develop this ministry while the missionaries are the ones in power.

Old Missionaries? The chicken and the egg cause each other and are the result of each other, just as the Church is with her mission. If the Church abides by this principle she does not need independent men called "missionaries", because a living Church is constantly a mission to itself and to others. Already there are too many Christians in the Church and too many ministers. The extension of one's Church beyond his circle of influence does not give birth to new churches and disallows the privileges and rights obtained from the Original Creator, Jesus Christ.

This is a call, not only for the abolition of missionary slavery but also for the destruction of the institutions of slavery, thus the mission boards. Rather than become the agencies of birth, these boards are responsible for stifling new development. Their existence is conducive to the immediacy of Western domination. They cannot inter-act with the new political and social systems that are rebelling against Westernization. Their work was very useful in preparing for the revolutionary era that Africa must enter, but a revolution means actual physical destruction of property and bloodshed directed against the old system. This violence is partly the outcome of missionary work whose introduction of international values and new gods, "Christ, God, Ghost and Co.", replaced the old African gods. By conquering the African tribes and their gods, the missionaries were instrumental to the change of which violence is a contingent. Violent change is therapeutic, ridding the self of its inferiority complex, extricating oneself from the Western gods.

Under Nationalism. During the rise of African nationalism, the missionaries began to feel guilty about their organizations and deliberately started to transfigure them. But mission is an integral part of a living Church, and must not be confused with colonial domination and the death of the colonizers. Church crusaders, careerists and extensions could have been eliminated as an independent system leaving the original and new churches to function as normal and productive bodies.

The conspicuous presence of any old missionaries or the representative of Old Boards even under new names is a demonstrative factor of Western imperialism. As a secularizing agency, Christianity is essential for liberating the Africans from clan ties and other parochial sentiments. This useful work of Christian missionaries has hatched a new chicken, leaving a dead shell. Unless they claim to be the message of Christ that they preach, they should leave the people to search for that message. Churches should deal with each other through international or intercontinental councils if they want to be ecumenical systems. My Presbyterian Church of East Africa is new to the American colonialism, but this is inevitable, given the disproportionate material conditions. But as blocs neither of the two Churches respects the other, though the rich one enjoys the ipso facto privileges of a donor. The presence of the Americans in Kenya, missionaries or otherwise, is subtle, conservative, fixed, entrenched and solid. With their presence it is hard for African businessmen or clergy to develop themselves because more time, money and energy are spent in adjusting to Western standards. It is physically ingrained in the minds of missionary converts that the missionary is a hero, expert and divine, a sub-creator in the pantheon hierarchy. Hence the attempt to modernize or reform the missionary system instead of destroying it is to spoil the mission of the Church by the retention of these basics of oppression. The missionary authority is historically racist, dehumanizing, and anti-socialist.

At the sight of a socialist revolutionary the missionary is immobilized, silenced and discontented. When the Africans want to do for themselves what others have pretended to do for them, real and violent conflict begins.

Soviet (National) Churches. The National Churches in Africa, stripped of the foreign elements, could incarnate themselves into their territorial conditions. Those missionaries who will not leave by cordial requests will only encourage the CIA and the USA military to intervene in foreign revolutions in the name of protecting their personnel. This happened in the Congo, where in the name of missionary rescue America intervened in a foreign crisis. Africans need a core of leadership that has greater interest in the country than heroism, martyrdom and morality.

With or without this national cadre the African Church will continue to grow. Now it is swelling to over one-hundred million people. The sociologist rationalizes this growth as mass escapism to religion in areas where drugs and alcohol are rarely accessible. The revolutionaries think it to be an opium of the people due to material deprivation, frustration and lack of political interaction. I believe that this proliferation is the work of the Holy Spirit calling the souls of men out of their suffering bodies and calling for heaven away from European economic domination. It is their duty to find a heaven for their souls, a heaven right here on Earth by destroying the Hell in which they live.

We need a guerrilla ministry as already pre-determined by the historical revolutionaries. Christians in Africa may not be Marxists or Maoists, but at heart they yearn for the structural changes which no peaceable measures can effect. This cannot be done through and by the missionary Christianity because it is a system of counter-C.I.A. and counter-Western violence. It needs a secret network among the Church leadership. Ho Chi Minh, the least fortunate of all the modern revolutionaries, became the most effective organizer of the Vietnamese people with a smaller personnel than any of the African Churches. Castro and others did marvellous jobs with small, limited numbers within committed nuclei. The African ministry belongs to the world of Mao and Castro and not to the world of Heath and Nixon. The autonomy of each village congregation with cohesive purpose and awareness for change does not need a permanent domination by a minister, nor does it benefit by the privatization of its ministry. The unity of the whole Church depends on how well the congregations can share, not only their funds but their ministry, and help in the creation of national values rather than tribal feelings which an immobilized ministry perpetuates.

Finally, violence per se, to occupy or maintain the present structures is non-productive for both the rebels and the status quo. An elaborate network of Church decentralization can help the revolutionary insurgents in the overthrow of the dominant alliance of the national elite and their foreign masters. The Vietnamese Christians are already on the wrong side of the fence and such a mistake should not be repeated by African Christians. Though a nuclear ministry is hard to train, it is cheaper and more durable a polity than the Western model. I need suggestions as to what a foreign missionary can offer in the revolutionary Africa.

p. 1

VIEWPOINT

Volume 8, Number 6 April 30, 1971

IN THIS ISSUE:

PEOPLE'S PEACE TREATY

EDUCATION PROCESS SURVEY

WHAT'S GOING ON HERE?

COCU AND PRESBYTERIANS

+ EDITORIALS, COLUMNS, POETRY

VIEWPOINT Volume 8, Number 6 April 30, 1971

This has been such a quiet and confusing year that the best we can hope for is next year will be better.
In that spirit we present some articles which may help to identify issues and possible responses...here at the seminary...in the church...and in the movement for people's freedom and peace.

Jan Fishburn's survey of PTS students was done as a project for Dr. Kerr's course, Relevance of Theology. The results of the survey are quite revealing. They tend to support many of our opinions about the lack of community and coordinated curriculum here.
Lev Sherman offers "commentary" on vital seminary issues such as relations with the Trustees, the President and the Professional Studies Committee.
Finally, Bob Craig contrasts the Presbyterian merger compromise plan against the hopes of COCU unity.

VIEWPOINT urges everyone to give very careful attention to the proposed Seminary Conference Charter printed in the April 30 WINESKIN.
This charter was worked out in recent negotiating sessions representing the various constituencies.
We laud the effort and will study the content.

There is still a chance to get your viewpoint in VIEWPOINT this semester. But the deadline for your manuscript is close: this Wednesday, May 5.
The VIEWPOINT box is in the basement of Stewart Hall.

STAFF

John Wilde, Editor
Bob Craig
Bruce Cameron
Billy Spenser
Glenn Weaver
Chris Plumb
Rollin Kirk
Jim Slicer, Consultant

CONTENTS

People's Peace Treaty.....p. 3

Editorials and Column.....p. 4

The Educational Process at Princeton Seminary.....Jan Fishburn p. 5

What's Going on Here? .....Lev Sherman p. 9

Trojan Horses, Albatroses and Other Exotic Creatures.....Bob Craig p. 11

At Eastertide.....Irene Tokar p. 12

1

VIEWPOINT

Volume 8, Number 6 April 30, 1971

IN THIS ISSUE:

PEOPLE'S PEACE TREATY

EDUCATION PROCESS SURVEY

WHAT'S GOING ON HERE?

COCU AND PRESBYTERIANS

+ EDITORIALS, COLUMNS, POETRY

EDITORIALS

Holy Week in Jail

Four P.T.S. students joined over 80 other seminarians from across the country in a peace sit-in in front of the White House on the day after Palm Sunday. This action resulted in their arrest and temporary imprisonment. VIEPOINT lauds this demonstration of commitment by Ed Bourtz, Tom Ross, Bruce Cameron and Craig Erickson against this cruel and apparently interminable war. We hope more seminarians will find meaningful ways to TELL IT TO WASHINGTON and keep the pressure on.

Curriculum Change

Yale Divinity School has put its resources on the line and has radically reformulated its curriculum. Yale's emphasis is now on missional involvement in local churches by teams of seminarians. Princeton does not have to follow Yale in its specifics, but it should be willing to openly and thoroughly begin to formulate a radical curriculum reconstruction. We stress openness and resolve. The resources of all—administration, faculty, students—should immediately be brought to bear in the creation of a new curriculum.

Students, especially, must be willing to thrust themselves into this effort. Curriculum reformulation will take place when students change their mind-sets and realize that drastic change is possible in a consciousness of positive determination.

For example, several possible options are: (a) a diversified track system with varying aims for an academic-ministry mix; (b) creation of community units, modelled on Princeton University's self-contained living centers with central academic, residence and social facilities (e.g., Princeton Inn, Woodrow Wilson College); (c) proposals such as those offered by Jan Fishburn in an article in this issue based on a significant survey.

Let's stop complaining about the stifling environment of P.T.S. let's accept our share of the blame. Then let's accept the responsibility of making the changes. Decision in favor of radical change is the only requirement for radical change. Submit your ideas to VIEWPOINT. Urge the student government, faculty and administration to take significant action on behalf of a new curriculum NOW.

****

KAIROS

This column is written for the purpose of encouraging concrete efforts to help renew the church of Christ. We must primarily be focusing upon the parish situation because of the hope abounding that the parish can be the foundation of community, and ultimately, global reformulation. And because this is the situation to which many, maybe most, of us are headed.

In the weeks and years ahead, we hope to awaken members of this community to many of the possibilities arising, enlist your involvement, and begin to build a network of colleagues here and elsewhere who can help each other to bear the incredible burden of the renewal of the church. KAIROS is intended to be more than this column. It is intended to be the focal point of this seminary's involvement in the movement to renew the church. Our task includes consideration of this seminary's life as a community of churchmen-in-training, but it goes beyond that. Our primary goal is the renewal of the church, not the reform of this seminary, although that will come as a revitalized church makes new demands upon its seminaries.

KAIROS is people, specifically located at Princeton Seminary, who want to claim the promise of God's magnificent Kingdom. We understand that NOW IS THE TIME. THE OPPORTUNITY for forging ahead to claim this promise here (on Earth) among human beings. We are not

really together yet in terms of strategies, tactics, or even in spiritual fellowship but we are ready to begin to get together for the task that God demands of us.

KAIROS would like to praise the groups at P.T.S., small or large, which have taken the responsibility of caring for fellow human beings. This task is absolutely vital and must be continued until every member of this community is given comprehensive, sustaining care. We also laud those people or groups of people on campus who have decided to pursur social action in its many forms. These efforts, too, must be expanded and all concerned must make sure these efforts succeed.

In this community of faith, KAIROS would like to help build awareness, sustenance, and determination. KAIROS is the corporate involvement of people who understand that they must be the church, engaged in mission together.

KAIROS is getting off the ground as a movement here because the consciousness of the demand upon us is growing. Perhaps you have felt it. What do we do next? KAIROS is YOU. (Cf. I Thess. 5:16-18, I John 2:6, I Cor. 1:28-31, Romans 12, Romans 8:31ff, Mark 8:27-9:1, I John 3:2, Acts 1-5. These Scriptures form a basis for a covenant for missional Christian communes). —J.A.W.

****

THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS AT PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

by JAN FISHBURN

INTRODUCTION

The following questionnaire was designed to answer the question, Does theological education at P.T.S. support or contradict the church status-quo?". "Status-quo is a loaded term and was not used in the questionnaire or the interviews with a random sample of respondents from which the averages on the following pages have been computed.

The questionnaire was constructed to be as objective and clear as possible. Interviews with the respondents were conducted to determine the reliability of the questions. Three questions were asked in the interviews. "What do you see as the weaknesses of the Seminary?" "What do you see as the strengths of the Seminary?" "What part of the questionaire interested you most?" Dr. McCord, Dean Nichols, Mr. Hansen and Mr. Byers were also interviewed. All quotes used in the report are drawn from the interviews.

The results of the questionaire seem to indicate that P.T.S. offers a smorgasbord of opportunities such that the theological student can choose and develop his own approach to church leadership. Therefore, theological educationaat P.T.S. both supports and contradicts the church status quo. Yet, the questionaire results suggest an uneasiness with the possibilities for reshaping the church.

A resonable response to the statistics in the report could be "So what's new?" The majority of students interviewed expressed strong concern about the lack of community at P.T.S. Community at P.T.S. is like the weather—everyone talks about it, and no one does much about it. The report analysis and proposal are an attempt to stimulate a reaction. While the accuracy of the statistics, the reliability and objectivity of the analysis and the wisdom of the proposal are all open to challenge, the goal of this report is to initiate a process of study and discussion by students, faculty and administration concerning the nature of the church and the role of the ministry.

The following questionnaire is designed to elicit your response on the basis of your experience at Princeton Theological Seminary. Rate each statement (except Yes—No questions) using the following scale: 1 = Strong, 2 = Adequate, 3 = Weak.

I. Community—The Student Handbook describes P.T.S. as "a community, where the common life of all is the concern of each member of the community and what happens to each member of the community belongs to the common life and well-being of all." The community is "comprised of faculty, students and staff."

1. Rate the quality of the common life at P.T.S. as described above. 2.64
2. Rate the extent to which each group participates in the common life as described above. Faculty 2.36, Students 2.55, Staff 2.55.
3. The handbook definition of community is relevant to theological education in 1971. Yes 8 No 3

II. Curriculum--The Plan of the Seminary (1811) included in the Seminary Bulletin cites the purpose of P.T.S. as being "the education of men for the Gospel ministry."

1. Rate the relevance of each P.T.S. department to that stated purpose.
   Bible 1.45, History 2.15, Theology 2.05, Practical Theology 1.65

The inclusion of Field Work among degree requirements implies that P.T.S. is a professional school as well as a graduate school.

2. Rate P.T.S. as:
   A. Professional School (vocational preparation) 1.82
   B. Graduate School (academic excellence) 1.73
3. Rate the effectiveness of your field work as a learning experience. 1.45
4. Rate the effectiveness of your field work supervision. 1.94

III. Course Structure--Evaluate the following possible course structures according to their effectiveness in enabling your personal and professional growth. Some of your courses may combine methods. Cross out any learning context that you have not encountered at P.T.S.

1. Lectures without precepts 2.1
2. Lectures with precepts 1.6
3. Project-oriented courses 1.83
4. Research-writing courses 2
5. Practicums 10
6. Independent Study 1
7. Discussion-oriented courses 1.75
8. Field Work 1.55
9. Seminars 1.6
10. Other __

11. Critical and reflective thinking is encouraged by the general academic atmosphere at P.T.S. 2.04

IV. Relevance of P.T.S. to Vocational Prepatation--Vocational preparation refers to any vocation directly related to the institutional church. Community, curriculum and course-structure are the integral elements of the concept of theological education assumed in the following statements.

1. Rate the extent to which the institutional church, as you know it, communicates what you believe to be the essence of Christianity. 2.64
2. Rate the extent to which P.T.S. prepares professional leadership to serve in support of the instituional church. 1.73
3. Rate the extent to which P.T.S. prepares professional leadership capable of re-forming the institutional church. 2.23

V. Personal Inventory

1. Rate your reasons (using the same 1 - 3 scale) for enrolling as a student at P.T.S.
   A. Church vocational preparation 1.55
   B. Self-understanding 1.5
   C. Graduate study of religion and theology 2.28
2. My experiences at P.T.S. have been helpful in increasing my self-understanding. 1.18
3. I expect to complete a degree program at P.T.S. Yes 8 No 3
4. I expect to pursue a church vocation upon completion of a degree program at P.T.S. Yes 8 No 3

Seminary Class 1 J, 5 M, 5 S
Degree Program 1 MRE, 9 M Div, 1 ?
live on campus 6 Off campus 5
Married 6 Single 5

Analysis of the Statistical Report

1. Community and the Church (Sections I and IV)

As a graduate school responsible for training men and women "for the Gospel ministry", the Seminary might profit from dialogue with the church concerning the nature of the church and the nature of the ministry. Dean Nichols says that the Seminary should always be developing ministers capable of "refining and reshaping the church." Student response in rating the effectiveness of the institutional church (2.64) indicates that they see a need for reshaping the church. Yet by responding that P.T.S. is slightly less than

adequate in preparing leadership capable of reshaping the church (2.23), they apparently feel that P.T.S. could be improved in this area.

The discrepancy between the responses to questions IV-1 and IV-3 raises major issues concerning assumptions about the ministerial role and the process of educating ministers. Does the insitutional church communicate the essence of Christianity? What does it mean to refine and reshape the church? What is the role of the minister in that process? What is the relationship of the Seminary to the church?

The answers to these questions are of considerable significance to the future of the church. The Seminary, as the intellectual center of the church, might initiate dialogue with the church in an organized, well-defined way. Participants should include representatives of all constituencies of the Seminary community, denominational and congregational representatives of the church, both ministers and lay workers. Although informal channels now exist between these groups, a commitment to reflecting together on the nature of the church and the ministry might result in the Seminary developing a surer sense of its goals in training ministerial leadership.

Before the Seminary can reach out to the wider Christian community which it serves, it would be necessary to begin dialogue within the Seminary community. The Princeton Seminary Conference, now being established "to consider and inquire into any question of Seminary concern" might be the appropriate group to initiate this dialogue.

If the correlation between I-1 and IV-1 reveals that students define the church as community, this raises the question of why they expect the Seminary to be a community as defined in the Handbook. Do students expect the Seminary to be an academic church? Why? Is it possible that the perennial student concern with the Seminary community is a camouflage for the deeper, more disturbing questions about the church as community and their role in it?

2. Curriculum (Section II)
Students rate P.T.S. as slightly better than adequate as a professional training school (1.82) and even better as a graduate school (1.45). A majority rate field work (1.45) as better than adequate as a learning experience. Yet, among the Seminary departments, only the Bible (1.45) rates as well as field work as being relevant to ministerial training. In a number of interviews, students reported that they feel barriers existing between academic departments are detrimental to their educational experience. They describe field work as the place where they are able to coordinate the academic disciplines otherwise fragmented by curriculum structure.

Assuming that a consensus can be reached in answering the issues raised in part one of the analysis, what then are the implications for the educational process? To what extent is increased departmental cooperation feasible and desirable? Is there a better way to relate field work and the academic disciplines? Can the Seminary utilize the resources in Princeton (the University and the Choir College) and the surrounding areas to improve the educational process?

3. Course Structure (Section III)
Results of Section III are difficult to interpret because it is impossible to separate instructor and teaching method. However, one obvious conclusion is that the course structure experienced by all respondents - lecture without precepts - is rated lowest as a learning experience. Independent study, the learning experience rated highest (1.) is the course structure least available to students.

This raises several issues concerning the value and expense of various teaching methods vs. total use of faculty time. Are independent studies and reading courses too expensive to be widely used? Are students capable of profiting from greater freedom in planning their own course of study? If Seminary students are not capable of independent study, what kind of

leadership will they provide for the church? Does the P.T.S. educational structure enable students to learn how to learn?

The Seminary can probably make better use of the resources within its own structures. The Christian Education department could be consulted in developing sensitivity to the learning process on the part of all who teach at P.T.S. Instructors should have the opportunity to experience a variety of teachung methods in an effort to improve their own effectiveness as teachers.

Task Force Study Proposal

Student government officers indicate frustration with student government structure and student apathy. It is possible that traditional forms of student organizations have outlived their usefulness and are too structured and inflexible to deal adequately with student interests and issues. An alternative to standing committees being used increasingly in local churches is the Task Force, formed for a specific purpose and disbanded upon task completion. A Task Force approach to student issues, plus as ombudsman to represent student opinion, is one alternative to the present form of student government. A small steering committee to identify issues and organize task forces may be necessary for co-ordination, but major emphasis would be on the issue-oriented task force approach. Each task force would generally include members from the student body, the faculty, and administration.

As a symbol of total community commitment to reflecting on the issues raised in section 1 of the analysis, a regular class day could be designated for organized study and discussion concerning the nature of the church, the minister and the seminary. One possible resource for class discussions is a paper on Ministerial Education by C. Daniel Batson, though every class would be free to approach the issues in its own way. The insights and viewpoints of all disciplines and a variety of theological attitudes would be represented in a campus-wide emphasis on these basic questions. Results of the discussions of each class could be studied by a steering committee responsible for appointing a Task Force to continue study and discussion of the issues. This Task Force might eventually participate in dialogue with denominational and congregational representatives of the church.

Upon completion of the work of the first Task Force, a second Task Force could be formed to study the educational implications of the results of the work on the nature of the church and the ministry. Standing committees now engaged in study in the area of curriculum and course structure might be replaced by a Task Force working on the issues raised in sections two and three of the analysis. Well organized Task Force work could be an exceptional learning experience. Consideration could be given to granting course credit for student Task Force work and faculty Task Force work might be regarded as the equivalent of teaching a course.

Conclusion

Students rate the Seminary as slightly better than adequate as both a professional school and a graduate school, yet weak as a community. The emphasis placed on the study proposal portion of this report is based on the assumption that community would result from working together on concerns common to all members of the Seminary community. The nature of the church and the ministry has been selected as a common concern of all members of the Seminary community. The potential inherent within the Seminary community bodes well for the future of the church. Yet in the circular relationship which exists between the Seminary and the church lies the danger of reinforcing each other as sterile institutions mirroring society instead of reshaping it. The Task Force Proposal is made as a step toward developing the full potential of every individual within the Christian community - both Seminary and the institutional church.

****

Be looking for yet another VIEWPOINT this semester! It will include articles on Romans and Abortion to name a couple.

WHAT'S GOING ON HERE?

by LEV SHERMAN

(Treasurer of the Student Association, 1970-71)

(ED. NOTE: The Editor wishes to apologize for the delay in the publication of this article which is of vital interest to this community. Hopefully the issues that are raised will be satisfactorily resolved in the next academic year. The article calls for a response by all concerned students. faculty, and administrators.)

This article was originally written for VIEWPOINT over a month ago. Since it was not published in the last 2 issues, I have revised it and updated it somewhat. I wrote the article because I saw a need to comment on certain developments linked to issues about which I had written earlier. This is therefore intended as further commentary on issues and events crucial to students at PTS, and in response to the general ignorance of the overall situation.

IN THE PAST YEAR AND A HALF, some students have been concerned over the economic policies in the investment of the PTS endowment. In working at this issue, we became increasingly aware of the lack of effective student participation in the decisions made concerning both the institution as a whole and the affairs of students in particular. For this reason, we shifted our primary focus to the issue of student representation on the Board of Trustees. In my last article (Vol. 8, No. 3), I briefly outlined the development of this situation and the Trustees' (Administrations') response. In January, The Trustees held an unscheduled (acc. to the By-laws) meeting. Cleverly convened in the midst of exams, most students did not even realize that their ultimate governing body was here. One of their main purposes was to consider three proposals made by the joint student-trustee committee, which had met again in New York after students rejected similar proposals made by the Trustees in the fall. The proposals which the Trustees received in January were hardly representative of the wishes of students on those issues (representation on the Board and its committees and the establishment of an all-seminary conference). Three of the four students on the joint committee voiced consistent opposition to the proposals as they were formulated. But since the Trustees voted as a block, the one student who sided with them was sufficient to allow the passage of all three proposals. So, the proposals which went into the Board meeting were little more than trustee proposals, plainly unacceptable to most students. For this reason, about 40 students gathered outside the meeting room, picketing entering members and urging them to vote down the worthless proposals. We had no illusions about our ability to influence their action, especially since President McCord had vowed to do "everything in his power" to push through the proposals. Also, one of the Trustees told us openly that he "didn't give a damn what we thought." We were present to protest and oppose this attitude. We held an open meeting of the issues and agreed that our most important action would be to continue to oppose <u>all</u> measures which do not offer students any meaningful increase in formulating the decisions which affect us. We also decided to continue to probe for new ways to realize the rightful demands for such participation.

The following week President McCord held an open hearing during which he defended the proposals. He denied even the principle of having students on the Board. ALL 3 proposals were voted down by the students the very next day. I feel that this rejection was a clear victory for the students of PTS. The Trustees proposals were nothing but a restatement of their past unyielding paternalism. They failed to take a single measure which would allow students to participate directly in the governing of Princeton Seminary. The students, more overwhelmingly than ever before, said NO to such stubborn arrogance. They voiced a growing affirmation of their just demands.

Since this referendum the issue of student representation on the Board has been dropped as a result of more immediate concerns (see below). But it seems to me that it is hardly a dead issue. We must continue to seek ways to gain access to the ultimate legal policy makers of this seminary. It is up to you to carry on that concern.

In the past weeks, several events have taken place which exemplify even more directly the

ineffective role of students in the practical affairs of the seminary. The first was the removal of several hundred forks from the Dining Hall as a protest against the change in policy on beverages. This has since increased into a discussion of the overall practices concerning the Dining Hall, especially in regard to the dictatorial policies that force students to eat there.

The second event was the selection of the new VIEWPOINT editor in February. It is not my intention to discuss the personalities involved. It seems clear that all 3 of the applicants were qualified and capable of the job. But the manner of selection raises questions of validity at several levels. The editor was chosen by a special committee drawn up specially for the single task of filling this position. It was comprised of 3 members of the administration (chosen by President McCord, and one of whom was openly antagonistic to one of the candidates) and 3 students chosen by the President of the Student Association. The fact that the latter chose to place himself on the committee is in itself questionable. But most disturbing is the entire nature of secret, behind-the-scenes dealing which pervaded the proceedings. How many students knew the position was open? How many knew how and when the editor was to be selected? I can certainly respond "not many" to the latter question since I am a member of the Student Council and was not even aware of the proceedings. But most importantly of all, I question the validity of such a committee choosing the editor at all. Although there is some vague tradition of VIEWPOINT being a media for students, faculty, and administration to exchange opinions, it has been entirely and fully a student-run operation for the past few years. I would like to suggest that the editor of a student publication be chosen by students, and not by some fly-by-night committee operating from the whims of 2 men. (ED. NOTE: The present Editor supports this position.)

THE DISPUTE WITH THE PROFESSIONAL STUDIES COMMITTEE

The third "event" is less tangible, but for many has been much more disturbing. It began as a rumour from several sources that the Professional Studies Committee (which rules on academic standing of students) was leading a full-scale purge to eliminate certain students. At first it was feared that this was aimed at individuals, as one student was told he was in danger of dismissal. But then, other students reported that some students had already been dismissed on academic grounds, and that the total number involved in condideration for such action was as high as 40. As the rumour began to grow, I was assured by several faculty members that there were no grounds for the fear that individual students were being forced out under the excuse of academic failure. A week later, President McCord called an M.Div student into his office and told him that he was dismissed from school (literally, that he was ordered to take a "leave of absence"). The reason given by the administration was that they felt this student needed a more therapeutic situation to work out his personal problems. It is somewhat ironic that an institution which, by reputation, has one of the best departments of Pastoral Counselling in the country, felt it necessary to expel one of its students because it was felt that his stay here would be dangerous to his sanity. More significant, however, is the fact that a conflicting reason was given by the Professional Studies Committee, which made the original decision for dismissal. The Committee told the student that the reason for its recommendation was purely academic! The student, who had received nothing less than a 2 prior to the first semester of this year, was quite surprised. In checking his record, he found that one of his courses drom last spring had failed to record a grade and that the Professional Studies office had given him an automatic failure without notifying the student. Calling the Professor, the student found that the intended grade was a 1! After contacting the Professional Studies Office, the grade was changed and the student was rapidly reinstated into the student body.

This case might seem to be a clear instance of clerical error. But several important questions must be raised in connection with it. Why was the student not granted his right (according to the Academic Regulations) of personal appeal, both before the committee and before the faculty? Why was he given no official notice of the committees' decision (according to Regulations also required) prior to his dismissal? Why was there the confusion and contradiction of reasons for dismissal? Even the faculty, who had approved the decision, knew

nothing of the specifics of the case. Finally, there is a large question of process. The Academic Regulations imply that a student be placed on probation for a semester before he can be dismissed for minimal academic shortcoming. Why did the Professional Studies Committee totally by-pass this procedure? The entire process of the recommendation and expulsion of this student took 2 weeks!

The disturbing anf foreboding nature of these unanswered questions should awaken us to some of the realities of Princeton Seminary. The minimal power of students to act on their own behalf was assumed. In this case, even the specified right of a student to defend himself was blatantly denied. There is also indication that the administration has recognized the danger of such overt contradiction of stated regulations. A recent report is that the Professional Studies Committee is in the process of rewriting the Academic Regulations to remove the protection of probation and the student right to appeal altogether.

Most students have moved along in their theological processing in ignorance of these developments. It seems clear that the time has come not only to open our eyes but to move out of the tightening squeeze. How long will you accept the secret proceedings of the administration in silence and in the name of expediency? The administration is geared to function as smoothly as possible, and in the hands of as few participants as possible. But at what cost? How many students are to be efficiently eliminated?

ACTION REQUIRED

Clearly the foremost problem becomes what action can be taken to remedy the unhealthy position of students on this campus. One remedy may lie in the formulation of the long debated Conference of students, faculty, administration, and alumni. (The April 30 WINESKIN has printed the proposed charter of this Conference after several negotiating sessions with representatives of all of the constituencies.) This Conference has the potential for creating needed communication on issues such as the ones discussed above...if you make it work that way. Think on the issues, and all that concerns you, and voice your opinions to student representatives (new Student Association officers, class presidents, and possibly, conference members).

****

TROJAN HORSES, ALBATROSES AND OTHER EXOTIC CREATURES

A PRO-COCU STATEMENT
by ROBERT CRAIG

In an age of localism, where both radical and conservative join in believing that if it isn't real at the local level, it isn't real, if polity is considered at all, it is in relation to the coming Church of Christ Uniting. Representatives of the Presbyterian Layman Committee travel about the land attacking its provisions. Adherants such as George Hunt plaintively plead that Paul's cry, "Is Christ divided?" has indeed structural implications while most laymen react like an elder in one of our field work churches, "It just doesn't seem important." Another in the same parish said, "Is it really important for us to dissipate our energies in order to create the outward image of a supposedly undivided church?" I would personally answer, "Yes." COCU in some form is important and deserves serious consideration as a step toward a more effective church mission in the United States. It is, however, a Trojan Horse for Presbyterians.

While clergy of various styles debate COCU, the denomination is for the first time in decades in danger of splitting and we are quietly accepting it. The Albatros of disunion on the way toward union is found in the current merger plans of the United Presbyterians and the Presbyterian Church in the US (Southern). The Southern denomination must have a three-fourths majority of the Presbyteries approve the merger. As witnessed in the PRESBYTERIAN JOURNAL, there is simply no chance that such a majority will be obtained. Therefore a compromise has apparently been worked out with the conservatives organized in a variety of divisive groups.

It is to allow their churches to leave the new united church and to take their share of the Presbytery and Synod funds and property. Apparently this provision will also apply to churches in the current United Presbyterian Church who want out. In short, instead of a step toward eventual unity of the evangelical churches, we will have atleast two churches continuing: merged and unmerged. Indeed since some of the southerners don't even like conservative northerners (they fought an attempt to merge with the Reformed Church in America) it is possible that in the name of unity we will see more, not less, ecclesiastical bodies. Picture the disruption which pro- and anti-unity leaders will cause in attempting to gain the allegiance of particular churches. Picture the confusion as you move toward ordination or attempt to be called by a church. Think of the hatred that will develop between separate Presbyterian bodies now no longer mixed theologically but alligned to a certain frozen theology. Think of the damage to Princeton Seminary which above all other Presbyterian seminaries is vulnerable to division. Indeed it is possible that if sufficient churches withdraw, an attempt might be made to take PTS along with them. What perfect irony if the site of COCU efforts becomes a sacrificial lamb upon the altar of schism.

I have just moved my membership from the Reformed Church to the UPCUSA. Part of the reason is the real liveliness which the variety of religious opinion within the UPCUSA provides. I accept that there is at present more difference within mainstream Protestant denominations and I am happy that this is the case. I look forward to even more creative tension in loyalty to our common Lord within the truely catholic, reformed and evangelical Church of Christ Uniting. It disturbs me deeply to see some of the potential being destroyed by the escape clause in the current Presbyterian merger negotiations. It makes no more sense to allow schism in the name of unity than it does to fight wars in the name of everlasting peace. The price is far to high.

****

AT EASTERTIDE
by IRENE TOKAR

What words of praise
Could I pen for Thee,
My Saviour and my Lord?

What words of adoration
Could speak, now
Of my joy?

O Lamb of God
And King of Kings,
Death cannot conquer Thee.

What was, and is
And e'er shall be
Until eternity.

To Thee, O Master,
At Eastertide, I give
My life, my love, my all.

Hallelujah and Amen.

****

IN NEXT VIEWPOINT ALSO...Mysticism and Man's Search for Meaning...A Series of Classical Poems.

****

"Freedom's just another word for nothing left to lose." - Janis Joplin

****